THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ) : (a) Reserve Bank of India (RBI) have reported that while banks are associated in the process of Selection of borrowers under PMRY as members so the Task Force Committee (TFC) formed for the purpose at District/Sub-Divisional/Block Levels, all banks in a district/block may not be members of the TFC.

(b) to (d) As per extant guidelines, applications for sanction of loans upto Rs. 25,000/- are to be disposed off within fortnight and those which are above 25,000/-, within 8-9 weeks. RBI have further reported that the decision to extend credit is left to the bank branch processing the loan applications. The reasons for returning the loan applications by banks, inter-alia, include (i) income of borrower exceeding the limit (ii) borrower already assisted under other schemes (iii) borrower already gainfully employed (iv) borrower being a defaulter to other banks and (v) Project being not viable/ bankable. It has, therefore, been provided in the PMRY guidelines that TFC should sponsor applications equal to 150% of the target fixed to enable banks to achieve targets allotted even after rejection of a portion of applications sponsored to them. Banks have also been allowed to receive the applications directly from eligible borrowers and forward the same to the TFCs with their views on the viability of the project/activity so that TFCs may sponsor such applications to the same bank branches for sanction of loan. The banks have been advised by RBI that they should indicate the specific reasons for rejection of applications sponsored to them by the TFCs.

Import of Rough Opthalmic Blanks

1661. SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the FERA authorities are aware that the Commissioner of Customs in a case under investigation by SIIB New Customs House, New Delhi pertaining to import of Rough Opthalmic Blanks from China had ordered for considering the price list of M/s Sumec China Jiangsu Machinery and Equipment Import and Export (Group) Corporation, China as the base for valuation of ROB imported from China by other importers who had on the basis of invoices of other suppliers from China by grossly getting the invoices under-invoiced of the same item have cleared their consignment;

(b) if so, the reasons for not complying with the above orders and releasing the withheld consignments on the basis of valuation done on the basis of price list of M/s China North Industries Beijing Corporation, China which is 30% less in value than the Sumec China prices thereby causing a huge customs duty loss to the Government and other agencies; and

(c) the action proposed to be taken in this regard as the difference in the invoiced prices has been transferred to the suppliers by way of Hawala transactions?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ) : (a) to (c) In a case of import of Rough Opthalmic Blanks, where the Bill of Entry was filed in October, 1996 by a Delhi based importer, it was observed that, on a comparison of the prices between the supplier, M/s. China North Industries Beijing Corporation, with those of M/s. Sumec China, the prices of the former were, on an average, lower by 18.71%. A show cause Notice was accordingly issued, wherein it was proposed to enhance the assessable value from Rs. 22.46 lakhs to Rs. 26.67 lakhs. At the time of adjudication, however, the assessable value furnished by the importer was accepted, on the ground that the goods supplied by M/s. Sumec were different, in respect of both quality as well as quantity, from the ones supplied by M/s. China North Industries. The prices declared by the assessee were found to be arrived at through normal negotiations, and were based on commercial considerations and the invoices were also certified by the Chinese Embassy in India, as well as the China Council for promotion of International Trade.

Since the declared value has been accepted, no action is proposed to be taken against the importer and therefore, the question of referring the matter to the FERA authorities does not arise.

Export to Indonesia

1662. DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI : Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state :

(a) the details of the different items exported to Indonesia at present;

(b) the total export of those items during each of the last three years, item-wise; and

(c) the projection made for the current financial year?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (DR. BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH) : (a) and (b) The basket of India's exports to Indonesia is highly diversified. The details of some major items of India's export to Indonesia during the last three years are as follows :-

(Value in US $ Million)

S.No.	Product	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
1		2	3	4
1.	Oil Meals	92.32	101.56	132.82
2.	Cotton raw Incl. waste	10.31	6.37	73.33
3.	Primary & semi-finished Iron & Steel	25.76	42.72	53.78
4.	Sugar & Molasses	NIL	35.16	52.79
5.	Groundnut	12.70	31.27	48.23
6.	Machinery & Instruments	24.51	41.54	35.47